REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ball et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,600,736) in view of Kallas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,778,653).

By this Amendment, Applicants amend the title to improve form, amend claims 1 and 11 to improve form, and add new claims 22-25. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21-25 are pending.

At pages 2-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ball et al. in view of Kallas et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of preserving state information for applications over a telephone interface using a voice application computer. The method, performed by the voice application computer, comprises identifying a user profile over the telephone interface using the voice application computer and telephone identifying information; identifying state information associated with the user profile, the state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, the voice application computer storing the user profile and the state information associated with the user profile; storing policies to control accessing of the plurality of cookies and storing of new cookies; automatically and selectively providing, by the voice application computer, a subset of the plurality of cookies to an application based on the policies; and storing a new cookie with the plurality of cookies based on the policies.

Neither Ball et al. nor Kallas et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in amended claim 1. For example, Ball et al. and Kallas et al. do not disclose or suggest identifying a user profile over a telephone interface using the voice application computer and telephone identifying information.

The Examiner alleged that Ball et al. discloses this feature and cited the Abstract, column 1, lines 15-53, Figure 1, and column 4, lines 5-9, of Ball et al. for support (Office Action, page 3). Applicants disagree.

The Abstract of Ball et al. discloses:

> Interactive voice response (IVR) services are provided to an end user at a telephone terminal (201) connected to the PSTN (202) through a telephone/IP server (205) that serves as an interface between the PSTN and an IP network (204) such as the Internet. A first IVR service is provided by a web server (203) running a service logic (207) for that service, which produces pages formatted in a phone markup language (PML) in response to an HTTP request sent over the IP network by the telephone/IP server to the web server at the URL address associated with the service. Hyperlinks to a second IVR service offered on a web server (208) at a different URL address are embedded and associated with a specific question or statement in a PML-formatted page produced by the first service. When the end user affirmatively responds to that statement or question through a verbal or touch-tone input, the telephone/IP server translates that response as a "click" on the hyperlink and establishes a virtual connection to the hyperlinked URL address of the web server providing the second service. Further, information associated with the end user's interaction with the first service, such as his identity, PIN, and/or zip code, is transferred to the second service by means of a cookie, URL encoding or other information transference mechanism, to provide an audio experience that seamlessly transfers the end user from the first service to the second.

In this section, Ball et al. discloses a first IVR service that is provided in response to an HTTP request sent over an IP network by a telephone/IP server. Nowhere in this section does Ball et al. disclose or suggest a user profile or telephone identifying information, let alone identifying a user profile over a telephone interface using the voice application computer and telephone identifying information, as required by claim 1.

At column 1, lines 15-53, Ball et al. discloses that in a traditional IVR system, an end user places a call to the IVR system and identifies himself by name and/or the input of an ID or PIN code through touch-tone or voice. Nowhere in this section does Ball et al. disclose or suggest a user profile or telephone identifying information, let alone identifying a user profile over a telephone interface using the voice application computer and telephone identifying information, as required by claim 1.

With regard to Figure 1, at column 4, lines 5-9, Ball et al. discloses:

> Upon answering the incoming telephone call, telephone/IP server 105, running interpreter 106, uses the called number to access a URL from its database (not shown) that identifies the first dialog in the service associated with that called number.

In this section, Ball et al. discloses that telephone/IP server 105 uses a called number to access a URL from its database that identifies the service associated with that called number. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, the service described by Ball et al. is not equivalent to a user profile. Applicants define a user profile in Applicants' original specification as a collection of information about a particular user (page 9, line 5). Therefore, the disclosure in Ball et al. that a called number is used to access a URL from a database cannot be equated to identifying a user profile over a telephone interface using the voice application computer and telephone identifying information, as required by claim 1.

Kallas et al. also does not disclose or suggest a user profile, let alone identifying a user profile over a telephone interface using the voice application computer and telephone identifying information, as required by claim 1.

Ball et al. and Kallas et al. also do not disclose or suggest identifying state information associated with the user profile, the state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, the

voice application computer storing the user profile and the state information associated with the user profile, as further recited in claim 1. The Examiner alleged that Ball et al. discloses these features and cited the Abstract, column 4, line 65 - column 5, line 29, and column 9, line 33 - column 10, line 15, of Ball et al. for support (Office Action, page 3). Applicants disagree.

The Abstract of Ball et al. is reproduced above. In this section, Ball et al. discloses a first IVR service that is provided in response to an HTTP request sent over an IP network by a telephone/IP server. Nowhere in this section does Ball et al. disclose or suggest state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, let alone identifying state information associated with the user profile, the state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, the voice application computer storing the user profile and the state information associated with the user profile, as required by claim 1. Instead, Ball et al. discloses information associated with an end user's interaction with a first service that is sent to a second service in the form of a cookie.

At column 4, line 65 - column 5, line 29, Ball et al. discloses a transfer capability that is provided to enable an end user who is connected via his telephone set to a first web-based IVR service to transfer to a second separately configured web-based IVR service without placing an additional telephone call, and wherein information associated with the end user's transaction with the first service is transferred to the second service in the form of a cookie. Nowhere in this section does Ball et al. disclose or suggest state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, let alone identifying state information associated with the user profile, the state

information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, the voice application computer storing the user profile and the state information associated with the user profile, as required by claim 1.

At column 9, line 33 - column 10, line 15, Ball et al. discloses that a cookie can be used to transfer relevant information from a first IVR service to a second IVR service. Nowhere in this section does Ball et al. disclose or suggest state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, let alone identifying state information associated with the user profile, the state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, the voice application computer storing the user profile and the state information associated with the user profile, as required by claim 1.

Kallas et al. also does not disclose or suggest identifying state information associated with the user profile, the state information comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers over a web interface and resulting from at least one telephone session, the voice application computer storing the user profile and the state information associated with the user profile, as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 2-4, 6-10, and 21 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al. for at least the

reasons given with regard to claim 1. Claims 2-4, 6-10, and 21 are also patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al. for reasons of their own.

Independent claims 11, 14, and 15 recite features similar to, but possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 1. Claims 11, 14, and 15 are, therefore, patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11 and claims 16-19 depend from claim 15. Claims 12, 13, and 16-19 are, therefore, patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claims 11 and 15.

New claim 22 depends from claim 1, new claim 23 depends from claim 11, new claim 24 depends from claim 14, and new claim 25 depends from claim 15. Claims 22-25 are, therefore, patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claims 1, 11, 14, and 15. Claims 22-25 are also patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al. for reasons of their own. Claim 22, for example, recites identifying a user associated with the user profile during a telephone session; determining a confidence level indicating an extent to which the user has been identified; creating a cookie associated with the telephone session; persistently storing the created cookie when the confidence level matches a first predetermined level; and deleting the created cookie at an end of the telephone session when the confidence level matches a second predetermined level. Ball et al. and Kallas et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features. Claims 23-25 recite features similar to, but possibly different in scope from, the features recited in claim 22. For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claims 22-25 are patentable over Ball et al. and Kallas et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

If the Examiner does not believe that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP

By: /Paul A. Harrity/
Paul A. Harrity
Reg. No. 39,574

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800
Date: July 20, 2006